LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

No. 1077

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 15 1970
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH COMPANY,
Plaintiff and Counterdefendant RESPONDENT

vs.

JAMES P. KELLY and YNES KELLY, husband and wife,
Defendants and Counterclaimants APPELLANTS

* * * * * * * * *

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Appeal from decision of Supreme Court of State of Idaho

JAMES P. KELLY and YNES KELLY, Pro-Se
P.O. Box 211, Jerome, Idaho

STEPHAN & BALLEISEN
Attorneys for Plaintiff and Respondent
Box 83, Twin Falls, Idaho

INDEX

Official report of case (459 P2d 349) (93 Idaho___)	1
History of case	1,7
Nature of Proceedings	1
Statement of Question Involved	6
Judgment appealed from	2,20
Statutes referred to	
28 U S C 1257(2)	3
42 Stat 212	21
Statute questioned	
Rule 56, Idaho Rules of Civil Procedure	3
Authorities cited	
Constitution of United States, Amend VII	3,6
Marburg v. Madison (1803)	10
Addenda:	
Opinion of Judge, Dist. Ct.	13
Order granting Motion for Summary Judgment	17
Judgment	18
Affirmation by Idaho Supreme Court	20

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH COMPANY, Plaintiff and Counterdefendant RESPONDENT	)
vs.	)
JAMES P. KELLY and YNES KELLY, husband and wife, Defendants and Counterclaimants APPELLANTS	)

* * * * * * * * * *

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

COMES NOW the above Defendants and Appellants and in pursuance to Rule 15, make the following Jurisdictional Statement:

(a) The above case is reported as 459 P2d 349, 93 Idaho ___, copy of which opinion is hereto appended.

(b) This was a case in which the Plaintiff sought an injunction against Defendants to enjoin them from interfering

with the removal of certain wires and poles from the property of Defendants; Defendants countersued, claiming the ownership of the wires and poles and asking for payment for Plaintiff's use of the wires and poles and demanded jury trial. Plaintiff sought Summary Judgment. Lower court dismissed Defendants counter-claim and granted Summary Judgment and Injunction to Plaintiff. Defendants claimed right to trial by jury and appealed to Idaho Supreme Court. Idaho Supreme Court reaffirmed lower court.

(ii) The date of judgment sought to be reviewed is Affirmation of Summary Judgment from Fifth Judicial District Court, ~~entered~~ filed by Supreme Court of State of Idaho on September 29, 1969, and decision denying Petition for Rehearing, ~~entered~~ filed on October 20, 1969. Judgment entered Oct. 21, 1969.

(iii) This appeal is taken pursuant to

28 U S C 1257 (2).

(iv) In that what is at issue here is the right of trial by jury to which Defendants have been denied, the authority for this appeal is the Constitution of the United States, Amendment VII, wherein the "right of trial by jury shall be preserved."

(v) This appeal questions the validity of Rule 56, of Idaho Rules of Civil Procedure, pages 345-360 Idaho Code, volume entitled "Idaho Rules of Civil Procedure":

"Rule 56(a) Summary Judgment--For Claimant--In a district court, a party seeking to recover upon a claim, counterclaim, or cross-claim or to obtain a declaratory judgment, may, at any time after the expiration of twenty(20) days from the service of process upon the adverse party or his appearance in the action or after service of a motion for summary judgment by the adverse party, move with or without supporting affidavits for a summary judgment in his favor upon all or any part thereof.

"Rule 56(b) Summary Judgment--For Defending party--A party against whom a claim, counterclaim, or cross-claim is asserted or a declaratory judgment is sought may, at any time, move with or without supporting affidavits for a summary judgment in his favor as to all or any part thereof.

"Rule 56(c) Motion for Summary Judgment and proceedings thereon.--The motion shall be served at least ten (10) days before the time fixed for the hearing. The adverse party prior to the day of hearing may serve opposing affidavits. The judgment sought shall be rendered forthwith if the pleadings, depositions, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law. A summary judgment, interlocutory in character, may be rendered on the issue of liability alone although there is a genuine issue as to the amount of damages. Such judgment, when appropriate, may be rendered for or against any party to the action.

"Rule 56(d) Case not fully adjudicated on motion for summary judgement--If on motion under this rule judgment is not rendered upon the whole case or for all the relief asked and a trial is necessary, the court at the hearing of the motion, by examining the pleadings and the evidence before it and by interrogating counsel, shall if practicable ascertain what material facts exist without substantial controversy and what material

facts are actually and in good faith controverted. It shall thereupon make an order specifying the facts that appear without substantial controversy, including the extend to which the amount of damages or other relief is not in controversy, and directing such further proceedings in the action as are just. Upon the trial of the action the facts so specified shall be deemed established, and the trial shall be conducted accordingly.

"Rule 56(e) Form of affidavits for Summary judgment proceedings--Further testimony--Defense required--Supporting and opposing affidavits shall be made on personal knowledge, shall set forth such facts as would be admissible in evidence, and shall show affirmatively that the affiant is competent to testify to the matters stated therein. Sworn or certified copies of all papers or parts thereof referred to in an affidavit shall be attached thereto or served therewith. The court may permit affidavits to be supplemented or opposed by depositions or by further affidavits. When a motion for summary judgment is made and supported as provided in this rule, an adverse party may not rest upon mere allegations or denials of his pleadings, but must answer in detail as specific as that of the moving papers, settingforth the material facts as he believes and intends to prove them to be. If he does not so answer under oath, summary judgment shall be entered against him.

"Rule 56(f) When affidavits are unavailable in summary judgment proceed-

ings.--Should it appear from the affidavits of a party opposing the motion that he cannot for reasons stated present by affidavit facts essential to justify his opposition, the court may refuse the application for judgment or may order a continuance to permit affidavits to be obtained or depositions to be taken or discovery to be had or may make such other order as is just.

"Rule 56(g) Affidavits in summary judgment proceedings made in bad faith. --Should it appear to the satisfaction of the court at any time that any of the affidavits presented pursuant to this rule are presented in bad faith or solely for the purpose of delay, the court shall forthwith order the party employing them to pay to the other party the amount of the reasonable expenses which the filing of the affidavits caused him to incur, including reasonable attorney's fees, and any offending party or attorney may be adjudged guilty of contempt."

(c) The question presented by this appeal is whether the right of trial by jury as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, Amendment VII, can be violated through use of the Summary Judgment procedure. The right of cross-examation, which is an inherent

part of the right of trial by jury "to face the accuser, to cross examine witnesses" is eroded through the use of summary judgment by a party wishing to avoid the uncertainty of a jury trial. This right is further eroded by a court using the statements, unverified and without the averer thereof undergoing cross-examination, as being completely true.

(d) The plaintiff telephone company constructed without federal permit a telephone line in 1942. In 1948 Defendants moved onto the land and received a patent from the United States for this land in 1960. In 1965 and 1966 the telephone company installed underground equipment on the north edge of the highway, abandoning its old facilities on the south side. Defendants claimed ownership of the poles and wires upon

their land by virtue of their patent from the United States. Plaintiff brought suit in 1966 asking that defendants be enjoined from hindering removal of the old equipment. Defendants claimed facilities were theirs because of their grant from the United States and filed counterclaim for the use of their land since 1960. The District Court in Summary Judgment proceedings granted a judgment for the telephone company and ordered a permanent injunction against the defendants. Defendants appealed to the Idaho Supreme Court and State Supreme Court reaffirmed lower court's decision. The defendants raised the question of their rights to trial by jury as follows:

1. by making demand for trial jury on their answer and counterclaim
2. by oral argument during the

summary judgment

3. by assignment of errors and by written brief in appeal to Supreme Court

4. by oral argument when case was heard by Idaho Supreme Court

5. by written brief on Petition for Rehearing, which was denied on October 20, 1969.

> "That the Defendants do here and now demand jury trial on the law and the facts"
> Transcript p.10 (Answer to Complaint and Counterclaim)
>
> "III There is a Constitutional Question, in that Defendants are entitled by the Constitution of the United States to a jury trial and this they have been denied by this decision of the Trial Court."
> Appellants Brief, P. 2 (Assignment of Errors)

The manner in which they were passed upon by the court - both the lower and appellant courts ignored this question and made no reference whatsoever to it

in their opinions or decisions.

(e) The question of the right of trial by jury is something which is at the very heart of the Constitution of the United States. A starting point for any argument on the Constitution would be the famous case of Marbury v. Madison (1803):

> "The Constitution is either a superior, paramount law: unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and like other acts is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it. If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the Constitution is not law; if the latter part be true, then written Constitutions are absurd attempts."

Just as Chief Justice Marshall's thoughts put the Constitution above ordinary legislative acts, so also does it put the Constitution above procedural rules whatever court they may be promulgated by.

Today our courts, including this United

States Supreme Court, are "plowing new ground" in reaffirming that the Constitution does indeed give certain unalienable rights to all of its citizens, among which is the right to trial by jury. Appellants are asking this court to uphold and reaffirm this Constitution of the United States. The right of trial by jury is an inherent part of the system of justice in America. This right has been eroded through many channels, one of which is the Idaho rule providing for Summary Judgment. The United States Supreme Court is the "court of last resort" to which its citizens can appeal in an attempt to reaffirm the primacy of the Constitution of the United States. The lower court and the Idaho Supreme Court refused to recognize the Constitution even though

it was properly brought up by the Defendants.

Thomas Jefferson, in commenting upon the United States Constitution, stated that "every generation must make the Constitution work for it", and in asking for this hearing on this important question, the Appellants are "making it work" for all Americans.

James P. Kelly

Ynes Kelly

Appellants, Pro se

ADDENDA

Opinion of Judge Sherman J. Bellwood, filed in Fifth District Court, State of Idaho, County of Jerome, Oct. 15, 1968:

Title & Cause:

On plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. The facts in this case are, for the most part, not in dispute. The facts are: In 1942 the plaintiff constructed a telephone line on the right-of-way of Idaho State Highway No. 25 along the north edge of N½NW¼ of Sec. 22, Twp. 8 South, Range 17, E., B.M., in Jerome County, Idaho, which property extends to the center of said highway. The highway right-of-way extends 200 feet north and 200 feet south of the center line of the highway. In 1948 the defendants moved upon the land above described and have there ever since. On May 17th, 1960, the United States of America issued to defendants a patent for said land. In the patent there was reserved "a right-of-way for a Federal Aid Highway under the Act of November 9, 1921." In 1965 and 1966 plaintiff installed a new telephone line on the north side of said highway right-of-way and it removed a part of the line facilities first above mentioned. Since that time defendants have refused to permit plaintiff to remove the rest of said line. Defendant have never consented to the use by plaintiff of

the telephone line facilities first above mentioned, and in fact the defendants have continuously billed the plaintiff "for the use of said telephone line and defendants' property."

Automobiles and trucks of the plaintiff have traveled up and down State Highway 25 and a county road on the west of defendants' property which intersects said state highway. Sometimes these vehicles travel slowly; sometime they stop on the roadways adjoining defendants property. The drivers and the passengers of said vehicles sometimes park at the aforementioned intersection, walk up upon adjoining property and look down upon defendants' property. In June of 1966 there was a man who identified himself as being connected with the telephone company - a Mr. Carpenter - who was with another man; they came upon defendants' property; defendants asked them to leave; they did. Before they left they attempted to talk with defendants. Plaintiff filed this lawsuit November 17, 1966, naming Mrs. Kelly as a party defendant. On one occasion, a State Electrical Inspector - Whitey Gates - went to an electrical supplier in Jerome and asked how much J. P. Kelly buys and when he buys it. James P. Kelly believes, but does not know, that this inquirer acts for the plaintiff. When a part of the telephone line in question was removed, as aforesaid, it was removed, according to Kelly, in the nighttime. When this lawsuit was filed the Sheriff of Jerome County served process upon the defendants at their home. On one occasion when Defendant Kelly was outside his home, on his

property, someone who has never been identified fired a rifle bullet which caused Mr. Kelly to fall to the ground and seek cover.

Out of these facts the plaintiff seeks the assistance of this Court in the removal of its telephone poles and lines from the north edge of the defendants' property on the highway right-of-way.

Out of these facts defendants claim ownership of the telephone line and its facilities. They seek to recover, for the privilege of plaintiff's use of the polelines, wires and appurtenances, $95,150.00 plus $26,005.81 accumulated interest, from January 27, 1958. Additionally, the Defendants seek to recover $540,000.00 "punitive" damages for wilful, deliberate and malicious harrassment which damaged the health and general welfare of the defendants. Defendants also seek injunction against plaintiff's continued harrassment.

In 1963 the defendants filed a suit in the U.S. District Court for Idaho, Southern Division, against the plaintiff and others, including "Professional Gunman No. 1 and Professional Gunman No. 2" whose true names were not known, seeking to recover $44,012,379.62 damages. The action included, among others, the claims in this present lawsuit. The U. S. District Court dismissed the action for a variety of reasons, including failure to state a claim, lack of jurisdiction for no federal question and for no diversity of citizenship.

The plaintiff is the lawful owner of the poleline it seeks to remove; the plaintiff has the right to remove the same from the right-of-way which it lawfully occupies. Plaintiff is entitled to summary judgment on its complaint. Defendants' counterclaim is untenable under the facts. Plaintiff is entitled to summary judgment on defendant's counterclaim.

The Court considered the pleadings, the depositions of the defendants, the interrogatories to plaintiff and plaintiff's answers thereto, deposition exhibits A, B, C and 1, the summons and complaint filed in the U. S. District Court in case No. 3841 which was lodged at the summary judgment hearing, the arguments of counsel and defendants at said hearing.

Counsel for plaintiff will prepare order for summary judgment and summary judgment in accordance herewith.

Dated and copies mailed to plaintiff's counsel and the defendants this 14th day of October, 1968.

Sherman J. Bellwood
Judge, District Court

##########

Order granting Motion for Summary Judgment, filed October 24, 1968:

Title & Cause:

A motion having been regularly made by the Plaintiff herein for Summary Judgment in the Plaintiff's favor for the relief demanded in the Complaint and in the Plaintiff's favor dismissing Defendants' Counterclaim on the ground that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the Plaintiff is entitled to Judgment as a matter of law;

Now, on considering the Pleadings, Deposition of Defendants, Interrogatories to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's answers thereto, deposition Exhibits A, B, C and the Summons and Complaint filed in the United States District Court in Case No. 3841 and arguments of counsel and Defendants at the hearing, and due deliber-

ation having been had, and the decision of the Court having been filed, it is

Ordered that said motion be and the same hereby is granted, and that Judgment be entered herein in the Plaintiff's favor for the relief demanded in the Complaint and in the Plaintiff's favor dismissing Defendants' Counterclaim.

Dated this 23rd day of October, 1968.

Sherman J. Bellwood
Judge, District Court

##########

Judgment, filed October 24, 1968

Title & Cause: A motion by the Plaintiff above-named for summary judgment in its favor for the relief demanded in the Complaint and in its favor dismissing Defendants' Counterclaim, having been duly brought on to be heard, and the Court having made an

Order pursuant thereto granting the Plaintiff's motion and directing that Judgment be entered herein in the plaintiff's favor for the relief demanded in the Complaint and in its favor dismissing Defendants' Counterclaim with costs and disbursements, it is hereby

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendants and each of them, be and they are hereby permanently restrained and enjoined from preventing, hindering and obstructing Plaintiff or Plaintiff's employees from removing its telephone poles, wires and related and similar property, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendants' Counterclaim be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Dated this 23rd day of October,

1968.

Sherman J. Bellwood
Judge, District Court

##########

Affirmation by Supreme Court

In the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho

Twin Falls, September Term, 1969
No. 10361
Filed Sep 29, 1969
Martin V. Huff, Clerk

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District of the State of Idaho, in and for Jerome County. Honorable Sherman J. Bellwood, District Judge.

Action to enjoin defendant-appellants interferring with the removal of telephone facilities. Summary judgment for plaintiff from which appellants appeal. Affirmed.

Stephan & Balleisen, Twin Falls, attorneys for respondent.

James P. Kelly and Ynes Kelly, Jerome, appellants, appearing pro-se

PER CURIAM

Appellants, James P. Kelly and Ynes Kelly, are the owners of real property situated in Jerome County, Idaho. Prior to their acquisition of the property, the State of Idaho secured a highway right-of-way across the property from the federal government in conformance with the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 212). Also prior to acquisition of the property by the Kellys, Plaintiff-respondent, telephone company, placed and thereafter maintained telephone poles and lines upon and along said highway right-of-way. Plaintiff-respondent sought to remove its telephone facilities and defendant appellants prevented the removal claiming ownership of the

facilities and that they were entitled to delinquent rental for the use of the facilities. Plaintiff-respondent brought action to enjoin defendant-appellants from hindering its efforts to remove the facilities. Plaintiff sought and gained summary judgment in the district court and defendants appeal.

This Court in State v. Kelly, 89 Idaho 139, 403 P2d 566 (1965), held that the portion of highway right-of-way in controversy here not used for actual road purposes is not forfeited to the owner of the fee title. The telephone company had the clear legal right to place and maintain their facilities upon the highway right-of-way, Idaho Constitution, Article 11, § 13, § 62-701, I.C., and such facilities impose no additional burden for which the owner of the fee is entitled to compensation. U.S. v.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., 318 U.S. 206, 63 Sup. Ct. 534 (1943).

The entry of summary judgment by the district court is affirmed. Costs to respondents.

#####################